

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-22 were pending in the present application. Claims 10-12 and 21 are canceled, and claims 1, 13 and 17-19 are amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-9, 13-20 and 22 are currently pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-16, 18, 20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended the second occurrence of “a service traffic flow” in each of independent claims 1 and 18 to be “the service traffic flow.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 18, and their dependent claims, are definite, and requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Morford et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,496,661 (“Morford”). Claims 1, 4-18 and 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morford in view of Qing et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0215817 (“Qing”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the elements of previously pending claims 10, 11, and 12. Basis for these amendments may be found, for example, in original claims 10-12 and paragraphs [0053]-[0078] of the original specification. Similar limitations have been added to independent claims 17, 18 and 19 as well.

In amended claim 1, the step of classifying and conditioning the service traffic flows entering into a core network at a downlink interface of an edge router according to the service traffic flow classification table comprises the following steps:

- obtaining, at the edge router, a service traffic flow identification of the service traffic flow entering into the core network;
- looking up the service traffic flow classification table according to the service traffic flow identification;
- classifying and marking the service traffic flows according to the corresponding priority and QoS class;
- shaping and policing the service traffic flows according to the corresponding bandwidth requirement; and
- selecting the forwarding mode and path of the service traffic flows according to the corresponding outgoing aggregation path information.

The Office Action alleges that the above steps are considered as being disclosed, respectively, in Col. 10 lines 10-12, Col. 11 lines 55-62, Col. 7 lines 7-12, Col. 6 lines 62-67, Col. 11 lines 17-21 and Figure 2C of Morford. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons:

1. Col. 10 lines 10-12 of Morford describes “The flow specification object attributes contain attribute identifiers having fixed sizes (e.g., ... service IDs, ... etc.), as well as the pointers to the corresponding attributes stored in the dynamic memory pool.” As can be seen, this portion only describes that the flow specification object attributes may include service IDs, but not a word of it suggests that an edge router can obtain a

service traffic flow identification of the service traffic flow entering into the core network as claimed in amended claim 1.

2. Col. 11 lines 55-62 of Morford describes a “traffic class comprises a set of matching rules or attributes ...,” but this traffic class is not disclosed to be a service traffic flow classification table. In addition, not a word of it mentions a service traffic flow classification table saved at an edge router, not to mention looking up the service traffic flow classification table according to the service traffic flow identification at the edge router.

3. Col. 7 lines 7-12 of Morford describes that the traffic management device 130 monitors the performance of one or more network applications and marks outbound data flows according to the performance attributes of the applications. Applicant, however, does not agree the marking function implies “classifying and conditioning of a traffic flow.” In fact, these functions are different from the step of “classifying and conditioning the service traffic flows” as claimed in the present application. Furthermore, according to amended claim 1, the step of “classifying and conditioning the service traffic flows” comprises multiple steps which are listed above and will be described below, none of which is disclosed or suggested by Morford.

4. Col. 6 lines 62-67 of Morford describes “Differentiated services network 50 can employ one to a plurality of differentiated network services technologies, such as diffserv (...), relative priority marking, service marking” Applicant does not agree that these listed generalized differentiated network services technologies used by a network correspond to a particular function of an edge router in classifying and marking a service traffic flow as claimed in the present application. In particular, not a word of

Morford discloses that an edge router in the network performs the particular step, nor does Morford teach or suggest this limitation.

5. Col. 11 lines 17-21 of Morford describes “a services table including ... 5) default bandwidth management policy.” This citation, however, does not disclose how the bandwidth management policy is used, nor does it suggest that the bandwidth management policy can be used in the shaping and policing of the service traffic flows. In other words, the mere mention of the term “bandwidth management policy” should not be regarded as having disclosed the shaping and policing step as claimed in the present application.

6. Figure 2C of Morford illustrates a first computer network connected to a second computer network by a plurality of links. It does illustrate that a router 23 is connected to the network 52 via two links. Even assuming this implies that the router may select one of the two links, the selecting of the forwarding mode of the service traffic flows according to the corresponding outgoing aggregation path information is not taught or suggested.

The Office Action seems to select similar words/terms in different sections of Morford, but overlooks the fact that the selected words/terms relate to different functions/techniques of a plurality of network components, but should not be regarded as the integrated processing flow performed in an edge router claimed in claim 1. That is, Applicant finds that the entirety of Morford, including the above mentioned portions, does not describe or suggest a solution comprising the above steps as claimed in amended claim 1.

Likewise, Qing does not teach or suggest a solution comprising the above steps as claimed in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 can not be rendered obvious by the cited references. For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is patentable over Morford and Qing under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

For at least the same reasons, independent claims 17, 18 and 19 are patentable over the cited references under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

March 8, 2010

Date

/Brian A. Carlson/

Brian A. Carlson

Reg. No. 37,793

Attorney for Applicant

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, TX 75252
Tel: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218